

REMARKS

Claims 10-28 are in the application. Responsive to the office action, the abstract has been amended. The claims have been amended to further distinguish over the prior art. Reconsideration of the art rejections under Section 103 is requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants traverse the rejection of all claims under Section 103 based on Dutta (U.S. 2002/0073204) in view of Molitor (WO02/23822). The rejection is deficient for at least two reasons. First, the primary reference Dutta does not conform with the claimed subject matter. For example, the rejection cites pars [0044] and [0045] of Dutta for disclosing (prior to the present amendment) a requirement of independent claim 10 that

each search function is further adapted to send at least a second search message comprising information about required resources to at least one of the ascertained communication components ...

but applicants do not find this subject matter disclosed in the reference. Rather, the cited paragraphs discuss contents of a query hit message returned by a receiving node. Par [0045] discloses that a Gnutella-enabled application may download a known and selected file to a user's node. None of this is the same as sending a "second search message" about required resources. A similar distinction exists for independent claim 28.

Secondly, while the rejection apparently recognizes that Dutta relates to file searching rather than locating a "communication service" (see page 4 of the office action), reliance upon Molitor does not and cannot compensate for this deficiency. With respect to the rejection, Molitor (page 8, line 13 - page 9, line 3, and page 11, line 15 - page 12, line 5) does not appear to provide any support other than an acknowledgement of the mere existence of IP telephony. Even applicants acknowledge that IP telephony is in the prior art. This is not the invention. The claimed invention addresses a need to identify, for example, gateways providing access between a VOIP network and an ISDN network. In fact, claim 28 is amended to more specifically describe such an embodiment.

The prior art does not disclose the claimed combinations. Nor is it seen that any of the claimed combinations can be reconstructed (even in hindsight) from the applied combination of references. More is required to reject the claims. It is incumbent upon the Examiner to show the

Serial No. 10/520,715
Atty. Doc. No. 2002P02867WOUS

invention in full detail by citing all requisite support. This has not and cannot be accomplished with the combination of Dutta and Molitor. Therefore the rejection must be withdrawn.

Independent claim 10 is amended to more clearly present the claimed subject matter. Independent claim 28 is amended to further define subject matter absent from the prior art. The claims are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants have provided good reason for withdrawal of the rejections. It is urged that the application is in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/27/08

By: 

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830